85-2074

No. _____

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 17 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1986

MARY E. BRACY
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,

VS.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMISSION,
AN AGENCY OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEFENDANT-APPELLEE.

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR
FOR THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

MARY E. BRACY
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT, PRO SE
3956 N. 11TH STREET
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN 53206
(414) 265-1142

51pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Did the State of Wisconsin violate the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in the matter of due process and equal protection:

(a) by restraining and oppressing a material witness from providing essential testimony at a final hearing?

(b) by proceeding to issue an award and final order in settling a worker's compensation claim where nature and extent of disability was the question without the needed medical information by which to make a factual judgment?

(c) by failing to comply and invoke it Worker's Compensation statutes Chapter 102 which provides the guidelines for settling disputes?

(d) by not requiring that the nature of the pre-hearing be placed in the record as called for in Chapter 102 Stats 102.17 (1) (a).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented i

Table of Contents ii

Table of Authorities.....iii

Jurisdiction.....1

Constitutional Amendments, Statutes...2

Statement of the Case 3-6

a. Denied Hospital Payment.....3

b. Hearing Notes Missing From Record..4

c. Restraining Witness.....4

Questions Presented are Substantial 7-10

Argument..... 11-12

Conclusion.....11

Appendix 1-33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

United States Constitution

Fourteenth Amendment Section 1

341 US 123

Article I - Section I - Section 9

Wisconsin Constitution

430 F2d 100 104 7 cr (1970)

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Fisher v. State

145 Miss 116 110 So. 361, 365

Johnson v. City of Wildwood,

184A 616, 116 NJS 462.

People on Complaint - Losquadro

v. Freudenberg.

171 NYS2d 585, 588, 10 Miss2d 1091.

State ex rel Strykowski v. Wilkie.

81Wis 2d 491, 512, 261 NW 2d 434

(1977)

Sunderland v. US CC Neb, 19 F. 2d 202,

216."Stanhope v. Brown County.

90 Wis 2d 832 836, 280 NW 711 (1979)

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE

UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1986

No_____.

MARY E. BRACY,

Plaintiff- Appellant,

v.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMISSION

Defendant- Appellee.

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

OF WISCONSIN

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Jurisdiction

This case involves the Constitutionality of the Court of Appeals of the state of Wisconsin to arbitrarily dispose of a worker's compensation application by disregarding the vested rights of an individual by not adhering to the standards of the Law.

Jurisdiction for the United States to review the Court of Appeals decision is conferred by Title 28 USCS, Section 1257. And under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

> "....when a party in state court claim that a right or immunity under the laws of the United States have been denied to him Congress has implemented this constitutional grant of jurisdiction by enacting USCS 28 1257 which powers the Supreme Court to review certain final judgments or decrees rendered by state courts."

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions

Relevant portions of Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution - Section 1 and sections of Chapter 102. Worker's Compensation statutes and Section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution are in the attached appendix at appendix

Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution a20 - Section 1 - Wisconsin Consitution a20 - Chapter 102 Worker's Compensation Act a21-27.

Statement of the Case

This case involves the Constitutionality of the Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution as it pertains to a fair hearing in resolving worker's compensation claims and what constitues a proper and fair hearing on the merits of the case.

Denied payment of Hospitalization:

This dispute arose out of a claim submitted to Maryland Casualty Co. (insurance) for payment of a 1980 hospitalization for the industrial injury of 1978.

Maryland Casualty denied payment and a pre-hearing was held September 30, 1982. During that hearing the plaintiff-appellant was restrained from speaking to any of the issues raised

and at the point of interposing to have the hearers know that the medical problem continued to be serious, the counsels and the hearing examiner moved to a private meeting on the matter.

Hearing notes missing:

Chapter 102 of Wisconsin State Statutes state that any testimony at a hearing is to brought to the final hearing - that information is missing from the plaintiff's record. At that pre-hearing the plaintiff was advised to get additional medical information crucial and equally crucial that they be aware of the reason it might not be possible to obtain and follow through on the request.

Restrained from giving essential testimony.

On September 19, 1983, a formal and

final hearing was held. Before it was the nature and extent of the illness and disability.

The plaintiff-appellant was restrained throughout the hearing if she wanted to venture any information other than that which could be tightly controlled. Under cross-examination by the hearing when he asked why medical care was not being received the plaintiff was further restrained from giving a calm answer of some substance to the understanding of what was hindering the getting of medical care.

Lacked medical referral provided in Stats 1Ø2 Worker's Comp.:

All attempts to get medical care have ended in dead lock and the marks (some still on the body) continue to

cause the plaintiff-appellant fear of losing her life if she attempts further. From those oppressions to be heard the plaintiff-appellant appeals from the summary disposition of the Court of Appeals from the State of Wisconsin.

SUMMARY ORDER

Entered December 10, 1985 by the Court of Appeals for the State of Wisconsin.

THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED ARE SUBSTANTIAL

The questions are substantial because the Worker's Compensation Act is to protest the life of every citizen that workes under the worker's compensation provision. Not one person should lose their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness because of an industrial injury as in this appellant's case.

In this case the State of Wisconsin has abridged a fundamental constitutional right in not providing full benefits of the statutes and futher abridged the appellant right to speakwhich are basic rights guaranteed under both the Unites States Constitution and the state Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment

is very clear that not one person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of the law.

A state governmental body violates due process when it fails to follow procedural steps to administer the law. 430 F. 2d 100, 104 (7 cr 1970). Presently there is no means for the appellant to get to the needed medical care and must rely on the State of Wisconsin to carry out the precribed statutes in a just way.

In the case of Fisher v. State, 145 Miss 116, 110 So. 361, 365. "We say that "Perhaps no pricise definition can be given it (fair trial) but it certainly must be one where the accused's legal rights are safeguarded and respected. There must not only be a fair and impartial jury and a learned

and upright judge to instruct the jury and pass on the legal questions, but there ought to be an atmosphere of calm, in which the witnesses can deliver their testimony without fear and intimidation and in which the attorneys can assert the defendant'sa rights freely and fully and in which the truth may be received and given credence without fear of violence."

If this case fails in this court it will be a serious defeat to human life because of the serious extenuating circumstances of the case and like in most cases where an indigent person parallels with the higher status there is hardly any change for a fair hearing.The most servious impact of this case is the sever interference in the medical service which has surpressed that appellant to the point

where - out of necessity the appellant must fear for her life - but the opression has the same impact under the constitution of cruel and unjust purnishment.

These questions are substantial because this case and its effects deny basic intent of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Argument

"The Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin has set forth that the Wisconsin Constitution Article 1, provides federal guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment. Stanhope v. Brown County 90 Wis 2d 832, 836, 280 NW 711 (1979).

This guarantee of an opportunity to be heard must be in a meaningful manner and at a meaningful time. State ex rel Strykowski v. Wilkie 81 Wis 2d 491 512, 261 NW 2d 434 (1977).

A "fair trial" is a legal trial conducted according to rules of common law except in so far as it has been changed by statute and one wherein legal rights of the accused are safeguarded and respected. Johnson v. City of Wildwood, 184A 616, 116 NYS 462.

A "fair trial" is a legal trial, or one conducted in all material things in substantial conformity to the law, and it is the duty of the court to comply with all procedural regulations. People on Complaint for Losquadro v. Freudenberg, 171 SYS 2d 585, 588, 10 misc.2d 1091

"Fair Trial" mean a trial conducted in substantial conformity to law, before an impartial judge and an impartial jury, in an atmosphere of judical calm that prosecuting attorneys language and acts are subject to control, that defendant shall have fair opportunity to outline defense..." "that judge will not extend his activities so far as to become in

effect either an assisting prosecutor or a thirteenth juror. Sunderland v. U.S. CCA Neb, 19 F.2d 202, 216." "Material evidence" is important evidence that must be carefully considered in order to fairly decide the merits of the proposition. Torrey v. Congress Square Hotel Co, 75 A2d 451, 456, 145 me.234."

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing, the plaintiff-appellant pleads the Court to review this case under its jurisdiction, remand the record, ask the lower court to take another look render a just decision under this Court's authority.

Mary E. Bracy

3956 North 11th Street

Milwaukee, WI 53206

(414) 265-1142

APPENDIX TO JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Court of Appeals Opinion and Order..a1-6

Circuit Court - Milwaukee County

Judgment.....a7-8

Labor & Industry Review Commission

Order.....a9-17

Department of Industry Labor

and Human Relations Worker's

Compensation Claim a18-20

Notice Summons - Circuit Court

Milwaukee.....a21-22

Constitutional & Statutory.....a23-30

Provisions

Notice of Appeal to the US.....a31-32

Supreme Court

Certificate of Service.....a33

al

DISTRICT I

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

COURT OF APPEALS

OF WISCONSIN

Marilyn L. Graves

Clerk

Madison, December 10,

1985

To Mary E. Bracy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Gordon Samuelson

Asst. Attorney General

C. Michael Hausman

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Clerk of Circuit Court

(L.C. #628-911)

(Milwaukee County)

Hon. Michael J. Barron

Milwaukee County Courthouse

You are hereby notified that the Court entered the following opinion and order:

85-0938 Mary E. Bracy v. Labor and Industry Review Commission

Before Moser, P. J., Wedemeyer and Sullivan, JJ.

Mary Bracy (Bracy) filed a claim for worker's compensation. The Labor and Industry Review Commission (LIRC) determined that Bracy had a ten percent permanent partial disability from a compensable injury and that no further treatment was required. The circuit court affirmed LIRC'S decision, and Bracy appeals. Based on our review of

the briefs and record at conference, we conclude that this case is appropriate for summary disposition. See Rule 809.21, Stats. We conclude there was substantial evidence for LIRC's determination and, therefore, affirm the trail court's judgment

Bracy was injured in a car accident while performing services as secretary to the Bishop of the Wisconsin-Upper Michigan Synod of the Lutheran Church of America (the Bishop). Bracy applied for worker's comepensation under ch. 102, Stats., and introduced evidence from Dr. John Melvin stating that Bracy had sustained a ten percent permanent partial disability on a functional basis as a result of the accident. Dr. Melvin came to no conclusion regarding Bracy's need for future medical treatment. The Bishop's medical expert, Dr. Everett Bragg, submitted a

written opinon that the injury had healed and that any future symptoms would be based on Bracy's underlying disc degeneration.

The determination of disability, its cause, extent and duration present questions of fact. Manitowoc County v. DILHR, 88 Wis. 2d 430, 437, 276 N.W. 2d 755, 758 (1979) (citation omitted). Departmental findings in this regard are conclusive if supported by any credible evidence. Id; see secs. 102.23 (1) and (6), Stats.

LIRC found Dr. Melvin's medical opinion credible and adopted it. It also adopted Dr. Bragg's opinion regarding future medical treatment. We are persuaded that these findings are not contradictory and are supported by Bracy's medical records and the opinions supplied by the physicians. Accordingly, there was substantial

evidence supporting LIRC's decision.

Alternatively, Bracy argues that LIRC failed to consider other relevant medical evidence of her condition. She asks us to remand the case so that she may present additional testimony regarding her claim. Bracy's request is untimely. Bracy had the burden of making an offer of proof to the hearing examiner prior to the court hearing of her case. See sec. 227.19 (1), Stats. She also had the burden of demonstrating excusable neglect or mistake for her failure to present this evidence in the proceedings before LIRC. Bracy did not make a prima facie showing on either point before the trial court.

We are satisfied that Bracy had the full, fair, public hearing contemplated by the worker's compensation statutes. She had an apportunity after her

hearing to move the commission to set aside, modify or change her award on the grounds of mistake or newly discovered evidence. Sec. 102.18 (4) (b), Stats. Bracy did not do so then and we will not permit it now.

Upon the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the order of the circuit court is summarily affirmed pursuant to Rule 809.21, Stats.

Marilyn L. Graves
Clerk of Court of Appeals

STATE OF WISCONSIN-CIRCUIT COURT-

MILWAUKEE COUNTY

MARY E. BRACY

Plaintiff,

v.

LABOR AND INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMISSION, MARYLAND CASUALTY COMPANY WISCONSIN-UPPER MICHIGAN SYNOD

Defendants.

The above action having come on for hearing before the Court, Mary E. Bracy, plaintiff, appearing pro se, Maryland Casualty Company and Wisconsin-Upper Michigan Synod, defendants, not having appeared herein, and the Labor and Industry Review Commission, defendant, appearing by Bronson C. La Follette, Attorney

General, and Gordon Samuelsen, Assistant Attorney General; and the Court having considered the matter upon the record and written and oral arguments of plaintiff and the defendant Commission, and the Court having issued its decision,

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the order of the Labor and Industry Review Commission, dated December 2, 1983, be and same hereby is, in all respects confirmed.

Dated this 29 day of April, 1985

BY THE COURT:

MICHAEL J. BARRON

CIRCUIT JUDGE, BRANCH 8

SATE OF WISCONSIN

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, LABOR AND HUMAN

RELATIONS

WORKER'S COMPENSATION DIVISION

P.O. BOX 79

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53707

79-01378

MARY E. BRACY

3956 N. 11th Street

Milwaukee, WI 53206

Applicant

Zubrensky, Padden, Graf & Maloney

606 W. Wisconsin Ave.

Milwaukee, WI 53203

Applicant Attorney

Maryland Casualty Co.

250 E. Wisconsin Ave.

Milwaukee, WI 53202

Insurer

Wis-Upper Michigan Synod 2

1933 W. Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, WI 53233

Employer

Frisch, Dudek & Slattery

825 N. Jefferson St.

Milwaukee, WI 53202

READ INSTRUCTIONS AS TO TIME LIMIT ON FURTHER APPEAL

This order becomes final in 21 days unless it is appealed to the Labor and Industry Review Commission. The petition must be received by the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations within 21 days. The form for petition will be supplied upon request. The petition need not be on

such form but should explain the particular finding or findings appealed and the reason for appeal.

If this order approves a compromise agreement, all terms of the agreement are in full force and effect. The order may be reviewed and modified by the Department within one year from the date the compromise agreement was filed with the Department or from the date the order was entered. If no application for review is filed within one year, the order becomes final, and the Department can take no further action.

If this order approves a stipulation, the case is open for a further claim by the employe if an application is filed with this department within 6 years from the last

payment of compensation for injuries occurring before January 1, 1978, within 10 years for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1978 and before May 13, 1980, and within 12 years for injuries occurring on or after May 13, 1980.

THIS ORDER HAS THE EFFECT OF DISMISSING THE APPLICATION ON FILE.

Hearing was held on September 19, 198
in

Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

APPEARANCES:

Applicant, in person and by
Attorney Philip Padden of
Zubrensky, Padden, Graf
Maloney; Respondent by
Attorney C. Michael Hausman
of Frisch, Dudek & Slattery

Conceded are jurisdictional facts, a weekly wage of $200 and a compensable accidental injury.

IN DISPUTE IS THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF DISABILITY

Upon the issue, the examiner makes the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

The applicant, Mary Bracy, sustained a compensable accidental injury to her head, neck and upper shoulder while performing services as executive secretary to the Bishop of the Wisconsin-Upper Michigan Synod of the Lutheran Church of America on December 1, 1978.

On January 18, 1979, the applicant experienced a attack of dizziness with continuing severe pain in the neck and

back. In March of 1979 she was admitted to Mt. Sinai Hospital with complaints of neck and left upper extremity pain. Such pain was diagnosed as possibly due to a cervical radiculopathy.

In July of 1980, the applicant was once again admitted to Mt. Sinai complaining of pain in the neck and back as well as difficulty in thinking and memory loss. The diagnostic impression was cervical pain syndrome.

In August of 1982, the applicant was examined and evaluated by Dr. John Melvin of the Curative Rehabilitation Center. Dr. Melvin is of the opinion that the chronic discomfort of which the applicant complains in her posterior neck with radiation into the

head and upper shoulder regions is secondary to chronic posterior cervical sprain and, therefore, is related to her industrial injury of December 1, 1978. As a result of such injury, Dr. Melvin is of the opinion that the applicant has sustained permanent partial disability on a functional basis in the amount of 10 percent. The examiner finds Dr. Melvin's opinions to be credible and adopts the same.

As a result of the foregoing, the applicant is entitled to 100 weeks of compensation at $65 per week, totalling $6,500, all of which is accrued. No additional medical treatment is indicated to cure and relieve the the applicant of the effects of the injury.

Counsel for the applicant has incurred $286.50 in costs to which he is entitled to reimbursement. By

request and pursuant to sec. 102.26, Wis. Stats., the attorney fee is set at 20 percent of $6,213.50, yielding $1,242.70.

NOW, THEREFORE, this

ORDER

That within ten days, the respondent and its insurance carrier shall pay to the applicant as compensation, the sum of Four thousand nine hundred and seventy dollars and eighty cents ($4,970.80); to Attorney Philip Padden, as attorney's fees, the sum of One thousand two hundred and forty two dollars and seventy cents ($1,242.70); to Attorney Philip Padden, as reimbursement for the cost of litigation, the sum of Two hundred and eighty six dollars and fifty cents ($286.50).

Dated at Madison
Wisconsin, This 30th Day of
September A. D, 1983.

William Phillips, Jr.,
Examiner

STATE OF WISCONSIN

LABOR AND INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMISSION

Claim No. 79

01378

MARY E. BRACY

3956 North 11th Street

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53206

Applicant,

v.

WISCONSIN-UPPER MICHIGAN SYNOD 2

1933 West Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Respondent,

MARYLAND CASUALTY COMPANY

250 East Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

Insurance Carrier.

--oo--

Pursuant to the timely petition for review filed in the above-captioned matter, the Commission has considered the petition and all relief requested. The Commission has reviewed the applicable records and evidence and finds that the examiner's findings and order are supported thereby. The Commission therefore adopts the findings and order of the examiner as its own.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Labor and Industry Review Commission does

O R D E R

That the findings and order of the examiner are hereby affirmed.

Dated and mailed at

Madison,
Wisconsin
this 2nd day of
December,
A.D., 1983.

David A. Pearson

Chairman

Pamela I.Anderson

Cmmissioner

Hugh C. Anderson

Commissioner

Philip L. Padden, Attorney

Zubrensky, Padden

Graf & Maloney

Suite 706, Wisconsin Tower

606 West Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53203

C. Michael Hausman, Attorney

Firisch, Dudek & Slatter, Ltd.

825 North Jefferson Street

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-6495

101:CD4266

Mary E. Bracy

VS. Plaintiff,

LABOR AND INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMISSION
MARYLAND CASUALTY COMPANY
WISCONSIN-UPPER MICHIGAN SYNOD
Defendant

628911

SUMMONS

Judge Michael J. Barron
Br. 8

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN, TO SAID defendant:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED AND REQUIRED to serve upon Mary E. Bracy, Plaintiff whose address is 3956 N. 11 Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53206 and answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you within 20 days after service and this summons upon you exclusive of the day of service, and in case of your failure so to do judgment will

be rendered against you according to the demand of the complaint.

Mary E. Bracy, Plaintiff

Post Office Address:

3956 N. 11th Street

Milwaukee, WI 53206

Filed December 27, 1983

Gary J. Barczak

Clerk of Courts

14943

CONSTITUTIONS, STATUTES, AND CODES INVOLVED

United States Constitution:

Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution Section I pertinent part:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of the law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Wisconsin Constitution:

Declaration of Rights. Section 1. (as amended Nov. 1982) "All people are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; to serve these rights,

governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Remedy for Wrongs, Section 9.

"Every person is entitle to certain remedy in the law for all injuries, or wrong which he may receive to his person, property or character; he ought to obtain justice freely, and without being obliged to purchase it, completely and without denial promptly and without delay, conformably to the laws."

Wisconsin Statutes - Chapter 102 - Worker's Compensation - 102.17 (1) (a) "Upon the filing with the department by any party in interest of any application in writing stating the general nature of any claim as to which any dispute or controvery may have arisen, it shall mail a copy of such

application to all other parties in interest and the insurance carrier shall be deemed a party in interest. The department may bring in additional parties by service of a copy of the application. The department shall cause notice of hearing on the application to be given to each party interested, by service of such notice on the interested party personally or by mailing a copy to the interested party's last-known address at least 10 days before such hearing. In case a party in interest is located without the state, and has no post-office address within this state, the copy of the application and copies of all notices shall be filed in the office of the secretary of state and shall also be sent by registered or certified mail to the last-known post-office address of such party. Such filing and mailing

shall constitute sufficient service, with the same effect as if served upon a party located within this state. The hearing may be adjourned in the discretion of the department, and hearings may be held at such places as the department designates, within or without the state. The department may also arrange to have hearing held by the commission, officer or tribunal having authority to hear cases arising under the worker's compensation law of any other state, of the District of Columbia, or of any territory ofthe United States, the testimony and proceedings at any such hearing to be repoorted to the department to be part of the record in the case. Any evidence so taken shall be subject to rebuttal upon final hearing before department."

Worker's Compensation 102.17 (1) (b) which provides for extra-ordinary circumstances. "In any dispute or controversy pending before the department, the department may direct the parties to appear before an examiner for a conference to consider clarification of the issues, the joining of additional parties, the necessity or desirability of amendments to the pleadings, the obtaining of admissions of fact or documents, records, reports and bills which may avoid unnecessary proof and such other matters as may aid in disposition of the dispute or controversey. After this conference the department may issue an order requiring disclosure or exhange of information or written material which it considers material to conference the department may issue

an order requiring disclosure or exchange of informationor written material which it considers material to the timely and orderly disposition of the dispute or controversy."

Statute 102.17 (1) (c) "Either party shall have the right to be present at any hearing, in person or by attorney or any other agent, and to present such testimony as my be pertinent to the controversy before the department."

Statute 102.17 (1) (g) "Whenever the testimony presented at any hearing indicates a dispute, or is such as to create doubt as to the extent or cause of disability or death, the department may direct that the injured employe be examined or autopsy be performed, or an opinion of a physician, chiropractor or podiatrist be obtained without

examination or autopsy, by an impartial, competent physician, chiropractor or podiatrist designated by the department who is not under contract with or regularly employed by a compensation insurance carrier or self-insured employer."

102.18 (1) (a) "All parties shall be afforded opportunity for a full, fair, public hearing after reasonable notice, but disposition of application may be made by comprise, stipulation, agreement, or default without hearing."

102.18 (1) (b) "After final hearing the department shall make the file it findings upon the ultimate facts involved in the controversy and its order which shall state its determination to the rights of the parties. Pending the final determination of any controversy before

it, the department may in its discretion after any hearing make interlocutory findings, order and awards which may be enforced in the same manner as final awards."

Administrative Code for that of Wisconsin:

80.08 "The department shall grant postponement and continuances only because of extraordinary circumstances."

COURT OF APPEALS STATE OF

WISCONSIN

CASE No 85-Ø938

Mary E. Bracy

Appellant

vs.

Labor and Industry Review Commission,

Appellee

Notice is hereby given that Mary E. Bracy, the above named appellant hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States from the Court of Appeals of Wisconsin entered on December 1Ø, 1985, summarily affirming an Order of the Circuit Court of Milwaukee County on an resolved worker's compensation case. The Court of Appeals order entered December 1Ø, 1985 was without resolution on the question of due process and equal protection of the law.

This appeal comes before the Supreme Court of the United States under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution and Chapter 102 - Wisconsin Worker's Compensation Statutes.

Dated: June 3, 1986.

Mary E. Bracy
3956 N. 11th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53206

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 31, 1986, I served by United States Certified Mail three copies of the corrected Jurisdictional Statement on the party below.

Stephen M. Sobota
Assistant Attorney General
P. O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707

Attorney for Labor and Industry Review Commission

TO: Supreme Court of the United States

Dated: June 29, 1986

Mary E. Bracy
3956 N. 11th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53206